

REMARKS:

Claims 1-12, 14 and 17-39 were pending in the application. Claims 11 and 33-39 have been canceled. Claims 1-10, 12, 14, 17, 18, 21-23, and 32-37 have been amended. Claims 40-53 have been added. Therefore, claims 1-10, 12, 14, 17-32, and 40-53 are now pending in this application.

Section 103 Rejections

Claim 1

Independent claim 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Binder, U.S. Pat. No. 7,200,152, Wood, U.S. Patent No. 6,007,372, and Rossetti et al., U.S. Pat. No. 6,420,963. Applicant submits that claim 1, as amended, is patentably distinct over the cited references. Claim 1 recites a “first network device” and a “second network device coupled to the first network device via [a] cable” that is “greater than 100 meters in length,” and “wherein the second network device is configured to receive data and power from the first network device via the cable.” Binder does not teach or suggest such an arrangement. This fact is unsurprising since Binder is directed to local area networks (LANs), which do not teach or suggest data/power transmission over cabling greater than 100 meters in length. *See* Applicant’s Specification at [08] (LAN transmission distances limited to 100m); [11] (power drop makes standard CAT-5 wiring impractical for power distribution over 100m in length). *See also id.* at [07] (noting that fiber cable is a dielectric and cannot conduct electrical power). Wood and Rosetti do not teach or suggest such limitations either. Instead, Wood merely teaches connecting a GPS receiver to a portable personal computer, *see* Wood at 1:53-63, and gives no indication of doing so at a distance exceeding 100 meters. Rosetti simply teaches a housing for an electronic device that may provide “weather protection.” Rosetti at 5:45. In short, none of these references teach or suggest the configuration recited in amended claim 1. For at least these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the § 103 rejections of claim 1 and its dependent claims.

Claim 17

Independent claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Hosaka, U.S. Pat. No. 6,448,500, in view of Wood and Rossetti et al. Claim 17 now recites that “the cable is greater than 100 meters in length.” While Hosaka discloses a type of cable, there is no suggestion that this cable is over 100 meters in length. On the contrary, the recitation in Hosaka’s background regarding shielded cables mentions as applications a LAN environment and wiring within personal computers. Wood and Rosetti do not teach or suggest the above-quoted limitation of claim 17 as stated above with respect to claim 1. For at least the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests removal of the § 103 rejections of claim 17 and its dependent claims.

Claims 23, 33, and 37

Independent claims 23, 33, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Binder in view of Wood, Rosetti, and Hosaka. Claims 33 and 37 have been canceled; the rejection of these claims is therefore moot. Claim 23 has been amended and is believed to distinguish over the cited references for at least the reasons given above with respect to claims 1 and 17. Applicant therefore respectfully requests removal of the § 103 rejections of claim 23 and its respective dependent claims.

Claim 32

Independent claim 32 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 in view of Binder in view of Wood. This claim has been amended and is believed to distinguish over the cited references for at least the reasons given above for claim 1. Applicant therefore respectfully requests removal of the § 103 rejections of this claim.

Claims 50 and 52

Newly added claim 50 recites a “cable” having an “outer-sheath surrounding” “first” and “second” sections, where the “second section including at least a pair of insulated wires configured to *carry power* from the first network device to the second network device, wherein the at least a pair of insulated wires *are between 10 and 16 gauge wires.*” None of the cited

references teach or suggest this combination of features, either singly or in combination. As such, claim 50 and its dependent claim are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited references.

Newly added claim 52 recites “a second section including a coaxial cable configured to carry power from the first network device to the second network device, *wherein a center conductor of the coaxial cable is of sufficient gauge to support current up to 60 amperes.*” None of the cited references teach or suggest this combination of features, either singly or in combination. As such, claim 52 and its dependent claim are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited references.

Numerous other dependent claims are believed to be patentably distinct over the cited references. However, given the fact that all independent claims are believed to be in condition for allowance, it is not believed necessary to address the other dependent claims at this time.

CONCLUSION:

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice to that effect is requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicant hereby petitions for such extension.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any fees that may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5957-03700/DMM.

Also filed herewith are the following items:

- ☐ Request for Continued Examination
- ☐ Information Disclosure Statement
- ☐ Notice of Change of Address
- ☐ Petition for Extension of Time
- ☐ Other:

Respectfully submitted,

Date: June 23, 2009

By: /Dean M. Munyon/
Dean M. Munyon
Reg. No. 42,914

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert & Goetzel, P.C.
P. O. Box 398
Austin, Texas 78767
(512) 853-8847